

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, has tentatively rejected all claims 1-12. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1, 5, and 9 to further define certain novel features. Applicant has also canceled claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, and 12. No new matter is added to the application by these amendments, nor are any new issues raised for consideration. In this regard, the independent claims are amended to expressly incorporate language that Applicant argued in the prior response. As noted below, the Office Action refused to accept Applicant's position by stating that the features argued by Applicant were not expressly embodied in the claims. Therefore, the Examiner has already considered these positions, and the entry of the foregoing amendments will therefore raise no new issues for consideration. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are the independent claims. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by *Chang*, U.S. Patent No. 4,886,979. Because claims 4, 6, and 12 have been canceled, Applicant will treat this rejection as applying only to pending claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 11. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action alleged that "...with respect to independent claims 1, 5, and 9, ... the claim language does not restrict the power line from being disposed within the host computer. In fact, Applicant's disclosure teaches the power line from being disposed in the host computer (fig. 4, main body 213 and second connector 217 of power line 210, which is anchored to host computer by add-on card port bracket 400, are disposed within host computer; par. 0025). "

On the contrary, **claim 1 reads on Fig. 2B, and not on Fig. 4 (as supposed by the Office Action).** In FIG. 2B, the power line 210 is NOT disposed within the host computer. The “add-on card port bracket “ is NOT an element of claim 1; that is, the “add-on card port bracket “ is not within the claim scope of claim 1; it is an alternative of this invention but not as claimed in claim 1. It is therefore improper to reject claim 1 by assuming the limitation of the “add-on card port bracket.” Without confusing the limitation of the “add-on card port bracket,” it is clear that the power line as claimed in the amended claim 1 is NOT disposed in the host computer. In this regard, claim 1 is amended herein to specify that “the power line is an independent device able to be movably connected to the monitor and the power supply but not fixed on the computer.” Therefore, and based on the position taken by the Office Action, independent claim 1 clearly defines over the cited art.

The Office Action further alleged that “.....with respect to independent claims 1, 5, and 9,The claim language does not restrict the first connector from being fixed to the computer. In fact, Applicant’s disclosure teaches the first connector, which is secured to the main body 213, being fixed to the computer by an add-on card port bracket (fig. 4; par. 0025).”

In contrast, and for similar reasons stated above, the “add-on card port bracket” is not within the claim scope of claim 1. In the amended claim 1, the limitation, “wherein the power line is an independent device able to be movably connected to the monitor and the power supply but not fixed on the computer,” is added for the purpose of further clarification over the cited art. This limitation is supported by the original application, including FIG. 2B. **Since the power line is NOT fixed on the computer; the first connector or the second connector, being an element of the power line,**

is by no means fixed on the computer. In addition, claim 1 further defines that “...**the first connector is plugged into the first power port of the monitor...**” It is therefore clear that the language of claim 1 (as amended) does restrict the first connector from being construed as being fixed to the computer.

The Office Action further alleged that “...Applicant also argues: ‘the power line as claimed in claim 1 is an independent device from the computer (see e.g. FIG. 2B).’ Yet again, the claim language does not support such a limitation; and Applicant’s disclosure teaches otherwise (fig. 4; par. 0025).”

In contrast, for the similar reasons stated above, the power line as claimed in claim 1, reading on FIG. 2B, is an independent device able to be movably connected to the monitor and the power supply but not fixed on the computer.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over Chang. And claims 5 and 9 are patentable over Chang for at least the same reasons. It is requested that the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 9 be withdrawn. Claims 3, 8, and 11 are submitted to be allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, 5 and 9, from which these claims depend.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action, and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response to Office Action. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Daniel R. McClure/
Daniel R. McClure
Registration No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500